

Arguments Against Ratifying the Constitution

Norma D. Johnson

Rationale

Although the seventh and eighth grade curriculum in United States History is a survey course, I do spend about two weeks on the Constitution. We talk a great deal about the writing and writers of the document, but have spent little, if any, time on ratification. I have been asked why it took so long for the last states to ratify when they only needed nine. I was never quite sure - now I have a better understanding.

Many of my seventh grade classes have even used the *We the People* activity to debate the Federalists against the Anti-Federalists. I have read the prep for the activity and listened to my students defend their side, but still did not have the background to answer questions about why they opposed and who these people were. We have issues in Nevada today that go back to some of the arguments the Anti-Federalists were concerned with then.

The time and research I have put into this paper have increased my knowledge and understanding of the issues of ratification. I can understand why they had a fear that their state's rights would certainly experience change and the uncertainty of how this would affect individual sovereignty.

We now, looking back, can see that in ways their apprehension was justified. Looking at history we note the Civil War started, in part, due to states rights and the South seeing their desires put aside by a government they felt did not understand their economic needs. Even today we have movements to press for states' rights. Do states' have control over the land within its borders even though it is federal land, Yucca Mountain??

I want the students to realize that not everyone was in favor of the Constitution and then I want them to think about the arguments against and see how good people can disagree, yet unity can be a major concern. There were heated debates, the occasional riot, and the public demonstrations against the Constitution. Anti-Federalist has some strong arguments that could still be valid today. What are the issues that are debated today? How has our form of government fulfilled some of the predictions of the Anti-Federalists? I want the students to think about these questions and form some opinions of their own.

I am much more confident now to teach this part of history and even though it will be several months before I am to that part in history, I am excited to share some of my new knowledge with my students.

Nevada State Standards

History:

- 1.8.1 Describe how an event is presented by multiple sources.
- 2.8.2 Evaluate sources of historical information.
- 6.12.8 Describe issues involved in the ratification of the Constitution.

Civics:

- 1.8.4 Explain popular sovereignty and the need for citizens involvement at all levels of U.S. government.
- 3.8.2 Define federalism.
- 3.8.3 Explain how the supremacy clause of the U.S. Constitution defines the relationship between state and national government.
- 4.8.6 Provide examples of contemporary public issues that may require public solutions.
- 5.8.6 Explain the necessity of the Bill of Rights for a democratic society.

Geography:

- 2.8.3 Compare how cultural characteristics affect different points of view with regards to places and regions.
- 2.8.4 Explain the role regions have played in selected historical events.
- 2.8.7 Apply the concept of region to examine a current event.

Chronological Content Outline

This is a very small part of the unit on the topic of the Constitution. I will present a general outline of the unit and highlight the section where my paper will be used.

Unit title: A More Perfect Union

- Articles of Confederation
- Shay's Rebellion & the economic depression after the war
- The slavery issues
- Constitutional Convention & Compromises
- **Ratifying the Constitution**
- A new nation is formed

For the students to have the knowledge to think about ratification they need an information base. They must know something about the Articles of Confederation and how the document was thrashed to become the Constitution. We put together a abridged version of the Constitution and this will help them to start thinking about arguments for and against. Without a good understanding of the Constitution they would not be able to discuss the Anti-Federalists argument.

Teaching Strategies

Debate: The Students will debate the issue of ratification and then take a vote on whether to add a bill of rights.

Pre-assignment: Homework assignment the night before this section begins:

- Each student is to ask 4 people to respond to this statement and record their answer completely. **Name 1 reason we do not need a Federal Constitution.**
- Set: On the overhead or blackboard write: **Reasons we do not need a Constitution.**
*In groups the students quickly compile the answer they have into 1 list. Write 1 answer from each group and continue until they run out of answers. Talk about whether a lot of people came up with an answer or could most people not think of a reason.

These lessons are designed for 75 minute classes.

Lesson #1:

- Define the words federalism, Federalist, Anti-Federalist
- Put students into 13 states (groups of at least 2) any extras are part of the larger states. Look at the geographic locations and discuss agrarian and merchant. Why did some support and not support the Constitution. Give them information on each state to look for answers.
- Divide states into Federalist and Anti-Federalist. Give them the rest of class to use research to find out why they were for or against the Constitution. Finish for homework if needed.

Lesson #2:

- Define ratifying, amendment, compromise
- Have Federalists meet in a groups of 3-4 and the same with Anti-Federalists. Give them time to compare information they found. Facts not opinions are necessary for debate. Do they have evidence to back up their stand?
- Have them meet then as a whole group if you have room so they can plan their strategy for the debate. Remind them that everyone has to say something.
- Tell them that during the next class they will debate the issues in an interstate ratifying convention (which did not happen –each state held one).
- Give them time to make their delegate name tags (authentic names from correct states could give them extra credit) and for homework they are to make a rally posters with at least 1 reason why they are for or against ratifying. (Dressing up for the convention could also net them extra points.)

Lesson #3:

- Have room set up for convention.

- They will need to put their nametags on and attach their posters to a ruler if they are not already on a stick.
- Have them set by state. Each person is to stand introduce themselves, their state and their stand on ratifying the constitution.
- Explain the rules of the debate (You can make yours up). These are mine. Each group (F and AF) will be given 2-3 minutes to state reasons. The rotation will continue until they quit talking or 10 minutes has elapsed. They can wave their banners whenever they agree or disagree, but no yelling or talking unless called on by the chairman.
- Correspondence was important during this time. Give them 10 minutes to write a letter to someone from another state that believes as they do.

Dear Fed/Anti-Fed:

Today in the convention I heard other men with my own beliefs say (3 things).

I am afraid they have forgotten about these points

_____.

I sincerely hope _____.

Your friend _____name_____ state

- Let them exchange with someone from another state, same viewpoint and give them a minute or so to read.
- Continue debates without the 2-3 minute rule. When the debate slows down or you run out of time tell them it is time to vote and hand out a ballot.
Yea Nay Yea with certain recommendations (bill of rights)
- Count up in class if there is time for discussion, if not, begin the next class with a count and debriefing discussion that includes how the states voted, when and why. You could also give the states their information in condensed form and let them tell the other states what they actually did at their convention, which is what I plan on doing.

Content Essay

In Five short years of Freedom weary grown
We quit our plain republics for a throne;
Congress and President full proof shall bring
A mere disguise for parliament and King...(Rutland, p.167, 1966)

The Anti-Federalists, who spoke out against ratification of the Constitution, connected their objections to the tyranny of the King and Parliament they had just thrown off with the Revolution. In this paper I will look at the Anti-Federalist argument consisted of specific concerns, voiced by a substantial portion of the population in every state of the new Union. By examining each state's ratifying convention, we can try to show whether the Anti-Federalists' objections had any impact on the state's final ratification.

I will begin by looking at some major objections of the time. The first was the **destruction of states** that would lead back to a monarchy. Anti-Federalists felt that states should be the primary unit of government, and that the central government should have little authority, which would act through the states to the people. It would be better if the thirteen-confederated republics would continue as they had under the direction and control of a supreme federal head for certain defined national purposes only (Kaminski & Leffler). States as smaller units of government would inherently be closer to the mind and desire of the people. Individual liberty, according to the Anti-Federalist, was dependent upon states. "It was thought to have been demonstrated, historically and theoretically, that free, republican governments could extend only over a relatively small territory with a homogeneous population (Storing, p.15). "Only small republics can enjoy a voluntary attachment of the people to the government and a voluntary obedience to the laws. Only a small republic can secure a genuine responsibility of the government to the people. Only a small republic can form the kind of citizens who will maintain republican government. These claims are central to the Anti-Federalist position" (Storing, p.16).

According to the Anti-Federalist, in a small unit of government it is easier for the people to have their wants and desires adequately represented. Representatives stay close to the mind and will of those they represent. According to Melancton Smith, a New York Congressman and avid Anti-Federalist, representatives "should be a true picture of the people; possess the knowledge of their circumstances and their wants; sympathize in all their distress, and be disposed to seek their true interest" (Storing, p.17).

Another argument for the idea of small republics was focused on the homogeneity of states as opposed to the national government. Those living within smaller areas would have more in common and therefore would be able to have harmony as they strove for their similar needs. Those living in states on the ocean, with a more urban society, would have little in common with states that were inland

and had a more rural lifestyle. Government in smaller units would in itself limit the discord and alienation which would naturally arise within the larger society, or a national government, with diverse goals and needs. General Sumter in South Carolina spoke of this when he urged for a postponement of his states convention because "people in the back counties were not sufficiently informed" about the Constitution (Rutland, p.167). Patrick Dollard, also of South Carolina, spoke about the geographical differences of the colonies when he reproached supporters of a Constitution that was "pregnant with a great variety of impending woes to good people of *the southern States*, especially South Carolina." He concluded that it would unleash upon the South more woes "than all the plagues supposed to have issued from the poisonous box of Pandora" (Rutland, p.168).

Second Anti-Federalists objected to the House of Representatives and the Senate. They felt that the House of Representatives was the only direct contact government would have with the people since the Senators were not elected by the people. Because they were the only real representation of the people, those campaigning against ratification saw several problems with its organization. The first was the size of the House. Because many state already had more than 65 representatives in their states legislatures, Anti-Federalists saw a 65 member House of Representatives as too small to represent the people adequately. In George Mason's speech to the Virginia ratifying convention, he addressed the concern he saw as "dangerous in respect to the number of Representatives: It does not expressly provide, that we shall have one for every 30,000, but that the number shall not exceed that proportion" (Kaminski & Leffler, p.43). Anti-Federalist Patrick Henry compared the vagueness of the language in this section of the Constitution to the reapportionment in England. He compared the size of Virginia to England and reminded the Federalist's that England had 530 representatives in Parliament and in the new Constitution Virginia would only be allowed 10 representatives.

Anti-Federalists also argued that the 2-year term would remove control of representation from the people. State legislators served one-year terms, and Anti-Federalists believed rotation in office was essential for the will of the people to be heard.

Yet another argument they voiced dealt with the House of Representatives being left out of the treaty making process. Treaties definitely affected the lives of many Americans, especially since many of the treaties were with the Native Americans and had to do with acquiring land in the West (Allen & Lloyd).

In opposition to the Senate, the Anti-Federalists voiced their third concern. First, why should a small state like Delaware have equal representation with Virginia and how could local people be properly represented? Second, would Senators' election, not by the people but by state legislatures, lead to elitists being re-elected and serving for life? John DeWitt of Massachusetts conveyed the Anti-

Federalist view that a Senator's serving "a serious portion of his life" will use this time to "increase their means and thus habituated to power, and living in the daily practice of granting favors and receiving solicitations, he may hold himself completely independent of the people, and at the same time ensure his election" (Kenyon, p.106).

The Federalist Farmer put forth arguments against the Senate. He concluded that "the senate is an independent branch of the legislature, a court for trying impeachments, and also a part of the executive, having a negative in making all treaties, and in appointing almost all officers" (Kaminski & Leffler, p.69). The fourth problem stemmed from the Vice President being the President of the Senate and able to cast a vote in case of a tie in the Senate. They saw this as violating the principle of separation of powers.

Anti-Federalists also had some strong concerns about the **Executive** branch of government. They saw the office as an elected King. They worried that the transfer of power would be chaos and that there was danger in giving power over the military and states' militia to one person. Another concern was the treaty-making power given to the President and Senate. How would that affect the common people, and why would they have no say in it? Anti-Federalists also were critical of the power the President had over the legislature with the ability to veto acts of Congress. Also, what if the President wanted to pardon his friends who had committed illegal acts? An article written to the Philadelphia Gazetteer in November 1787 stated, "If we are not prepared to *receive a king*, let us call another convention to revise the proposed constitution, and form it anew on the principles of a confederacy of free republics; but by no means, under pretence of a republic, to lay the foundations for a military government, which is the worst kind of all tyrannies" (Kaminski & Leffler, p.87).

Anti-Federalist viewed the **federal judicial system** as a threat to individual liberties and state's independence. How far could the judges expand their role? There was nothing in the Constitution to guarantee civil trial by jury and judges could take over matters that had been the jurisdiction of lower courts. They worried that the jurisdiction of the federal courts was too broad and not clearly defined.

...those who are to be vested with it [judicial power] are to be placed in a situation altogether unprecedented in a free country. They are to be rendered totally independent, both with respect their office and salaries. No errors they may commit can be corrected by any power above them, if any such power be, nor can they be removed from office for making ever so many erroneous adjudication. Brutus XI (Kaminski & Leffler, p.121)

Next, what would it **cost** to run this new government? Could the new United States afford the expenses involved in implementing this new Constitution? Again,

this was a concern expressed by the Anti-Federalists. In *Letter of an Officer of the Late Continental Army*, William Findley voiced many concerns about the new document: "The new government will be *expensive* beyond any we have ever experienced; the judicial department alone, with its concomitant train of judges, justices, chancellors, clerks, sheriffs, coroners, escheats...will be a burden beyond the utmost abilities of the people to bear..." (Lewis, p.132). Many more arguments were raised concerning the expenses that would be involved in maintaining a standing army, revenue officers, and a whole host of government workers who would "devour the hard earnings of the industrious - like locust of old, impoverishing and desolating all before them" (Lewis, p.132).

What about a **bill of rights**? Anti-Federalists maintained that certain rights that were basic to individual freedom and that those rights needed to be written down. to remind and protect them. Anti-Federalist's believed that by including their rights in the Constitution, people would be able to know when the government was threatening their rights. As on other issues, Anti-Federalists viewed the new Constitution as extremely ambiguous, especially in terms of individual rights. In the postscript to a letter to Governor Edmund Randolph of New York, Richard Henry Lee of Virginia wrote that "universal experience has found, that the most express declarations and reservations are necessary to protect the just rights and liberty of mankind from the silent, powerful and ever active conspiracy of those who govern..." (Kaminski & Leffler, p.156).

The Bill of Rights was the major accomplishment of the Anti-Federalist movement. This was the concession made by Federalists in order to get the needed nine states to ratify the Constitution. There is a lot of debate today about whether this was good or bad, but it is a legacy that many believe belongs to Anti-Federalists. The different states' bills of rights did not look the same, Madison was able to draft one that became part of the Constitution. Agrippa wrote, "We do not by declarations change the nature of things, or create new truths, but we give existence, or at least establish in the minds of the people truths and principles which they might never otherwise have thought of, or soon forgot. If a nation means its systems, religious or political, shall have duration, it ought to recognize the leading principles of them in the front page of every family book (Storing, p.70).

Some New England Anti-Federalists also proposed a **religious test** to ensure the elected were Protestants of high moral character. Although the view was very sectional, it was still a point or argument in various ratifying conventions.

How did the Anti-Federalist campaign against ratification play out as each state debated ratification? The second part of my paper will address this question. Each state will be discussed in order of ratification. For some the process was simple and held little debate, but some states drag their feet through the whole process.

Delaware was the first state to ratify the Constitution on December 7, 1787 with a vote of 30 to 0. In addition to ratification it asked the new government to consider a ten square mile parcel for a federal capital to be ceded to Congress. In a correspondence to Trench Coxe on December 3, Jacob Brown expressed the feelings in Delaware: "the State of Delaware will be the first in the Union in the adoption of the new Constitution. They meet this day and I expect will finish this week" (Jensen, p.106). It was in the best interest to ratify and the swiftness took the Anti-Federalists by surprise giving them little time to affect the vote.

On December 12, 1787 the **Pennsylvania** Convention ratified the Constitution, 46 to 23. They were the first to convene their convention and the first to hold serious debates. The debates were dominated by James Wilson who seemed to anticipate every argument presented by the Anti-Federalists. After ratification in Pennsylvania the Anti-Federalists went on the offensive and wrote many essays and pamphlets "to stall ratification, if not by repealing it in Pennsylvania, then at least by slowing or preventing the process in other states" (Gillespie & Lienesch p. 177).

New Jersey ratified the Constitution on December 18, 1787, with a unanimous vote of 38 to 0. New Jersey had supported the Federalists in the Constitutional Convention and just as Charles Pinckey predicted: "Give New Jersey an equal vote and she will dismiss her scruples and concur in the national system" (Jensen, 1978 p. 251).

On the last day of 1787, December 31, **Georgia** became the fourth state to ratify the constitution with a vote of 26 to 0. Georgia needed help from the national government against the Native Americans to the south and west of the state. They thought that their speedy ratification would help if an Indian war broke out. Georgia had asked for help from its neighbor states but to no avail. President George Washington was supposed to have later declared, "The United States are at peace with all the world except the state of Georgia" (Jensen V. .III, p. 211).

The fifth state to ratify, with a vote of 128 to 40, was **Connecticut** on January 9, 1788. The majority of newspapers were pro-ratification as well as the sermons given by the clergy each Sabbath. There was a bandwagon feeling throughout the state. Connecticut had two political factions: agrarian, who opposed the added powers of Congress, and merchants, which included the Connecticut elite and outnumbered the Connecticut agrarian 3 to 1. This shows up in the final vote for ratification. The most vocal debates were in the various town meetings that elected delegates. One newspaper reported there might be "Judases" in the convention and that several towns had rejected the Constitution (Jensen V. III).

Massachusetts became the sixth state to ratify the Constitution, 187 to 168, on February 6, 1788, with the addition of a set of recommended amendments. There was a lot of opposition to the Constitution when the

convention opened. Ratification was largely due to the support of Samuel Adams and John Hancock, although some will dispute their importance in the ratification convention, who both “had sincere doubts about the proposed system. Moreover, their support was contingent, hinging upon recommendatory amendments that were to limit the federal government in a number of ways” (Gillespie & Lienesch, p. 138). Hancock proposed several modifications to the Articles in the Constitution and an amendment “to reserve all non-delegated powers to the states”(Gillespie & Lienesch, p.153). The Massachusetts vote against ratification was definitely regional. In the East merchants voted 73% in favor of ratification. The central section, farmers, were overwhelmingly against, 86%. In the West it was split slightly against, 58% to 42%. Ratification passed because the majority of the people lived on the coast in urban areas (Franklin, p. 190).

The seventh state to ratify was **Maryland**, 63 to 11, on April 21, 1788. Maryland's Anti-Federalists argued that the proposed system would surely jeopardize the interest of the state. Luther Martin, an Anti-Federalist delegate to the convention, had a bad case of laryngitis so he was forced to write, which was a blow to the Anti-Federalist movement. He wrote in a pamphlet entitled *The Genuine Information* that “the new system would annihilate all the states governments indiscriminately” (Gillespie & Lienesch, 1989).

On May 23, 1788 South Carolina ratified the Constitution 149 to 73 and proposed some amendments. The Anti-Federalists in the western parts of the state, it was reported, “conducted ceremonies of a different kind. They had a coffin painted black, which borne in funeral procession, was solemnly buried, as [an] emblem of the dissolution and interment of publick liberty” (Gillespie & Lienesch, p.201). The leading Anti-Federalist in South Carolina, Rawlins Lowndes, expressed “fear that the South would suffer in a new nation dominated by a majority from the Eastern states, deplored the loss of state sovereignty...and predicted the new government would probably end in monarchy” (Kenyon, p.177). He was worried about the system of taxation that would come from the federal government. Another concern the southern states had in common was the insufficient protection of slave property.

New Hampshire was the ninth state to ratify, on June 21, 1788 in a close vote of 57 to 47, and also proposed amendments. Although most thought there would be a speedy ratification, they were wrong. Anti-Federalists had canvassed the backcountry, inflaming the people against the new government (Gillespie & Lienesch). Anti-Federalists in New Hampshire attacked the Constitution for failing to include a religious test for office holders, unlike other states who wanted a guarantee of religious freedom. They expressly declared “that republican government depended upon morality and piety, rightly grounded on evangelical principles” (Gillespie & Lienesch). They viewed the tolerance of slavery in the Constitution as morally wrong and fatal to the new republic. Like so many other states they wanted an expressed bill of rights, which they proposed as twelve amendments.

Virginia became the tenth state to ratify on June 25, 1788, with another close vote of 89 to 79, and proposed its own set of amendments. The leading opposition came from Patrick Henry who actively tried to organize the Anti-Federalists ranks to insist upon a conditional ratification based on acceptance of a bill of rights. Henry warned those in attendance "if the Constitution was adopted, Virginia would have no security against the emancipation of slaves..." (Rakove, p.124). Henry's original twenty amendments were sent to a committee to be written and sent to the federal government.

In a very close vote, 30 to 27, **New York** became the eleventh state to ratify on July 26, 1788. At the beginning of the convention Anti-Federalists were in the majority, 46 to 19, but by the time the vote was taken the Constitution had already been ratified by the nine needed states. Anti-Federalists did not waver in their campaign, however. In New York they drafted fifty-five amendments and no longer spoke of rejection, but focused on ratifying with provisions. John Lansing wrote a set of "explanatory" amendments including a bill of rights and "reserving the right to withdraw" from the Union, (Rakove). Federalists and some of the Anti-Federalists rejected the latter. The Anti-Federalists in New York came closer than their counterparts in any other state to stopping ratification, but with the acceptance of proposing conditional amendments their "solidarity collapsed" (Rakove).

Over a year would pass before **North Carolina** became the twelfth state to ratify on November 21, 1789. The year before, August 1788, in their first ratifying convention, they had refused to ratify. The argument centered on the definition of rights, which to an Anti-Federalist was defined as "essential to the very existence of the publics (communities, states, nations), that rights defined the purpose of these publics, which was to secure freedom, meaning the rights of people to rule themselves" (Gillespie & Lienesch, p.344). In the end they sent a declaration of twenty rights and twenty-six changes to the Constitution to Congress to consider and adjourned their convention. They did not meet again until November 1789. Madison announced in May 1789 that he would submit amendments to Congress the next session, hoping to bring ratification to a close. By the following November, when the second convention had convened, "rank anti's" had become "perfect fed's"; an "amazing change" had taken place in the sentiments of the people" (Gillespie and Lienesch). By now a bill of rights in some form seemed a foregone conclusion.

The thirteenth and last state to ratify was the small state of **Rhode Island** on May 29, 1790 with an extremely close, 34 to 32 vote. President Washington had already been elected and the first Congress was in session by this time. Rhode Island's stalling brought to light one of the Anti-Federalists most objectionable provisions in the Constitution. If a state failed to elect federal senators and representatives, as Rhode Island had failed to appoint convention

delegates, Congress would have the right and obligation to step in and provide for an election. The delay in holding a convention meant that Congress could also place economic sanctions against Rhode Island, and on January 15, 1790 it did just that. Some towns who supported ratification even asked Congress for protection if they seceded from the state and joined the Union (Gillespie & Lienesch). On May 13, 1790 Congress passed a bill to boycott Rhode Island. No American ships could enter the harbors in Rhode Island and their ships could not enter the United States ports. They were no longer part of the new nation. Commerce by land was likewise restricted. Congress also demanded that Rhode Island pay its debt of \$25,00.00 by December 1, 1790. Ratification came shortly after by pressuring the opposition. The state was back in the Union.

Anti-Federalists, during this period following the writing of the Constitution, were not all equally concerned about the same issues and had varied ideas about the need for a bill of rights and what that bill of rights should include. Their voice changed from state to region to town changing often because of the people's social and economic status. Their concerns were real and their vision for this new country as important as those who did not question the new Constitution. Even though they did not achieve their goals of rejecting this new document, they were able to stall the implementation and push forward their bill of rights issues. They did not abandon their ideas, but many did realize the need for compromise and unity. They relinquished their arguments and stood back to watch the experiment run course. They may still be watching.

Annotated Bibliography

Allen, W.B., Lloyd, G., (Ed.). (1985). The Essential Antifederalist. New York: University Press of America.

After a short introduction to each section the book is a collection of writings by Anti-Federalists. They are divided by topic, which makes research easier.

Bailyn, B., (Ed.). (1993). Debate on the Constitution Part I. New York: Literary Classics of the United States.

A book of primary sources letters, newspaper articles, etc. dealing with both sides of the debate. I only used volume 1 although there are 2 volumes.

Cornell, S. (1999). The Other Founders: Anti-Federalism and the Dissenting Tradition in America, 1787-1828. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina.

This book looks at the "plebian" Anti-Federalist as one from the lower status or backcountry segments of America. He also talks some of the "elite" and "middling" class Anti-Federalist. His main objective was to look at how strong the Anti-Federal movement was with the less educated segment of society. The problem was finding material on the "plebia" because they did not write as much.

Franklin, B. (1894). Geographical Distribution of the Vote on the Federal Constitution 1787-8. New York: Orin Grant Library.

An interesting map was included with this book showing the distribution of the Anti-Federalists according to voting. It is a short book that looks at why people in certain areas were Anti-Federalist or Federalist.

Gillespie, M.A. Lienesch, M. (Ed.). (1989). Ratifying the Constitution. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press.

It was one of the most informative for looking at ratification by states. It gives a good overview with an excellent bibliography. You have both sides of the states issues.

Jensen, M. (Ed.). (1978). The Documentary History of the Ratification of the Constitution. V. III – VII. Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin.

There are seven volumes to this complete set. It takes each state and through letter, and state ratifying convention records looks at each states ratification with accompanying commentary by the editor.

Kaminski, J.P., Leffler, R. (Ed.). (1989). Federalists and Antifederalists the Debate over the Ratification of the Constitution. V.I. Madison: Madison House.

A good book to use to understand the specific arguments the Anti-Federalist had in terms of republican government, the House and Senate, the President, the judiciary, and the Bill of Rights.

Kenyon, C.M. (Ed.). (1966). The Antifederalist. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

A good introduction is given to the primary documents included in the book. Since they were all Anti-Federalists you could understand their point of view. The index in the book was very helpful. Most of the other books did not provide one.

Lewis, J.D. (Ed.). (1967). Anti-federalist versus Federalists. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing.

This book contained documents that were written by both groups. The book is divided, not by topic, but by point of view. So it was easy to find the information needed.

Lynch, J.M. (1999). Negotiating the Constitution. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

The first two chapters dealt with the issue of ratification, but focused on the "Necessary and Proper Clause." There was a lot of detailed explanation, but I found it was hard to read and understand.

Rakove, J.A. (1996). Original Meanings. New York: Vintage Books.

I used this book quite a bit. Chapters V and VI were very helpful. In Chapter V he discussed in limited detail ratification by state, which helped with the second part of the paper.

Rutland, R.A. (1996). The Ordeal of the Constitution. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

His information relating to those who lived in what was known as the backcountry was useful. The poem in the beginning of this paper was found in this book.

Storing, H.J. (1981). What the Anti-Federalists Were For. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Not a very big book, but it was very helpful in writing both parts of this paper. I was concise and to the point. It was also an easy read.

Additional Sources could be obtained from the UNR Library. They are extremely numerous. There are also many articles written, but the UNR Library did not have any of the articles on file or microfiche.